This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

Bought from P.M. Hill 90/195.

pol
3/10/

211 e. 1603

ELEANOR DYOTT.

And little deem'd he what thy heart, Gulnare!
When soft could feel, and when incens'd could dare.

Lord Byron.

MEMOIR

OF

MRS. DYOTT,

UNDER THE

SOLEMN FORM OF AN OATH,

WRITTEN BY HERSELF,

ACCOUNTING FOR

HER SEPARATION FROM GEN. DYOTT,

WITH

Various Letters

OF THE

GENERAL AND OTHER PERSONAGES.

"Patience is the surest remedy against calumnies: time soon or late discovers the Truth."

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR W. WRIGHT, 46, FLEET STREET.

1821.

[*Price Two Shillings.*]

16 DEC 1964

LONDON:

SHACKELL AND ARROWSMITH, JOHNSON'S-COURT.

INTRODUCTION.

"Fier de la liberté d'exprimer ma penseé je sais dire la "verité avec courage; je me garderai d'offenser la con- "venance, mais je demasquerai le vice.

It seldom happens that a female unjustly accused and mal-treated, appeals to a generous and enlightened public in vain. The Author of the following pages claims only that indulgence, which, as an Englishwoman, she considers to be her birthright,—*to be heard at the bar of public Justice before condemned.* It is true, a sort of *legal-mockery*, which, perhaps, my enemies may construe into a trial, took place; but that justice which in Britain is supposed to flow spontaneously to meet anticipated wrong, has been denied me.

In the darker ages of priestcraft, when tyranny and oppression swayed the sceptre of ignorance, woman was considered in those times of bigotry, a sort of secondary being—and her rights and

privileges withheld from her as if unworthy to enjoy them: passing from the dominion of that age of superstition to the present time, we find England, which was so elegantly painted by a celebrated author, "*cette terre elassique de la liberté,*" is in the present siécle returned to its former darkness, and though freed from the dominion of monks, it is overwhelmed in our days by that of lawyers, who are no less numerous in this great metropolis than locusts in the plains of Egypt.

The machinations employed against me by those *creatures*, (disciples of Themis), at the instance of a husband who ought to have protected me, have forced me to give an *echantillon* of these *locust-lawyers*—and I do flatter myself, that there is not one honourable person in the United Kingdom, that will doubt the fidelity of the *portraits* I have drawn of an *English Attorney* and an *Irish Proctor.*—We find too a JUDGE IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY, placed on his Magisterial Bench, MISDIRECTING the jury in my case, and obtaining a verdict by these *odious means*, and what is still more extraordinary, an uncle appearing voluntarily as a witness against his niece, and using every *ruse* that *falsehood* could suggest to ruin and destroy her.—One sees also an old aunt *inspired*

by hypocrisy, and three sisters playing a rôle in the same drama equally disgusting—but it is too true, when once the arm of calumny is employed against the female character, she finds often that her own family are the last to shield her from the base attacks of the calumniator—thus she is often deprived of her repose unjustly from the want of friends to espouse her cause.

In the present case we see a husband resorting to the most illicit practices to degrade that wife whom at the altar he had sworn to protect, and employing those *hireling-locusts* by every means of *chicane* to disturb her happiness, and destroy her repose for the sake of gain.—But the success of this avaricious husband will be short-lived—the tide of reason will return and take its proper course, and the exposer will become the exposed—in spite of all the sophisms of an Attorney-General, the *misrepresentations* of a judge, and the testimony of perjured witnesses.

From the earliest epoch of history, we find that woman has always been judged by partial justice. "Le cœur des femmes," says a modern writer "est comme ce pays inconnu où l'on aborde sans y penetrer."—St. Jerome declares that *a good woman is more rare than a phœnix*—Boileau, Shakespeare, and even that *little*

crooked thing, Pope, have assisted, with all their malice and their might, to calumniate our sex—Such is the fate of unhappy woman—whilst man may enjoy himself as a lawless libertine—woman, poor weak woman, it would appear, is destined by nature to be the victim of prejudice, and her fair fame is often blasted by the whisper of malevolence, or the suspicions created only by the heated imaginations of a jealous brain.—She is reproached without a shadow of real proof—it is enough for men unaccustomed to reasoning, and unacquainted with the world, that she is reproached!!!

The Author has been indignantly attacked and calumniated in the public opinion, by a husband who was evidently the aggressor. He found means to employ her own relations to second his views.—Strange reversement of ideas!—strange transposition of persons and things!—and yet more strange, when it is well known by all her real friends, that her soul would revolt at any act derogatory to the strict laws of morality and delicacy.

The following materials, under the solemn form of an Oath, will shew the odious attempts that have been made to ruin her character, and deprive her of her property. I write not for myself, for I prefer freedom in an humble cot-

tage, rather than be the victim of tyranny under the appearance of splendid magnificence. I have committed these sheets to the press for society in general, of which individual liberty is the true and only safeguard.

ELEANOR DYOTT.

Blackheath, Jan. 21, 1821.

MEMOIR.

Sworn the 17th Day of January, 1821.

BEFORE THE

LORD CHIEF JUSTICE

OF HIS MAJESTY'S

Court of King's Bench.

Eleanor Dyott, of Blackheath Vale, Blackheath, in the county of Kent, Gentlewoman; maketh oath and saith, that this deponent was married in the month of January, 1806, to Lieutenant General William Dyott, after a few months acquaintance,—That she brought him a fortune of more than two thousand pounds a year, out of which was settled at the time upon this deponent the sum of eight hundred pounds a year for pin money. Deponent saith, that not long after marriage, the said William Dyott threatened to knock her down,—and continually extorted

her pin money from her and otherwise ill-treated her, until she ultimately made up her mind to separate herself from him altogether. Deponent saith, that the following extracts of letters, and other paper writings, plainly shew that the said William Dyott, had in view from the first, pecuniary interest, which in the event of a divorce, would materially benefit him; and this fact is particularly proved by his Bill in Parliament, by which he attempted, as deponent has heard and believes, to deprive her of her pin money, secured to her by her marriage settlement, dated 11th of January, 1806, and settled upon her out of her own property, though it left to the said William Dyott, as sworn by himself, in Doctors' Commons as deponent has heard and believes, a residue of one thousand six hundred pounds a year. Deponent saith, that a negociation for, and the subsequent separation, as will be seen by the following documents, and which appeared on the trial of the cause in the Court of King's Bench, as deponent has heard and believes, actually took place long before she ever saw or heard of the object of General Dyott's action; —deponent saith, therefore, that the views of General Dyott in seizing an object, however ephemeral, will appear manifest to any unprejudiced mind, when it is considered that deponent never saw the defendant in General Dyott's action till August 1814, and then in his professional capacity, which was many months after these documents had been written.

MR. PRICE, TO MRS. DYOTT.

Lincoln's Inn, 5th August, 1813.

MADAM,

I have perused your marriage settlement, and am satisfied, that General Dyott and the trustees, cannot dispose of your property, without your consent in writing, first had and obtained.

(Signed.) WILLIAM PRICE.

GENERAL DYOTT, TO MR. HARMAN.

Clifton, 1st Feb. 1814.

MY DEAR SIR,

I thank you for the trouble you have been so good to take respecting the transfer of Mrs. Dyott's funded property.—I will give you directions for an abstract of a joint deed of settlement being made out, and then submitted for the opinion of some eminent conveyancer, and sent to you for your approbation.

(Signed.) WILLIAM DYOTT.

MRS. DYOTT, TO EDWARD HARMAN, ESQ.

Clifton, 2nd of February, 1814.

SIR,

I beg to send you enclosed, a paper written as you will perceive, by General Dyott's own hand, and to add that I will not execute any deed respecting the transfer of the funded property.

(Signed.) ELEANOR DYOTT.

Mrs. Dyott, to General Dyott.

February, 1814.

Sir,

Upon the receipt of your last letter, it was my intention to have waited for the further communication which you suggest without any observation upon it; but I wish to offer to your consideration, the very desirable object of relieving us both from the necessity of entering more particularly into unpleasant circumstances and altercations.

You are no doubt fully aware of the operation of law upon the whole of our unhappy case, and I trust, I shall also be properly apprized and advised of it.—You have a near relation in the profession—I can only rely upon the integrity and character of a stranger; but having consulted him, (Counsellor Griffith) I am willing to leave it to those two gentlemen, without resorting further to arrange and settle our differences, as far as may be, for the future satisfaction of each.

Eleanor Dyott.

Same to the Same.

February 8th 1814.

Sir,

Under the very particular circumstances existing between you and me, I have judged it expedient to appoint Mr. Griffith, of Bristol, my Counsellor, and have autho-

rised him, to propose to you, and to carry into effect, in proper form, the following terms: that we should reside separately, and that I should receive half the income of my property, including my pin money.—I desire to have the sole care of my daughter, and permission to see my sons at any time I may think proper.—I presume you will see the propriety of these terms, and suffer them to be adjusted privately by Mr. Griffith, as I should be very unwilling to pursue a more public mode of proceeding; and it may prevent any unpleasant altercation if you would transmit your sentiments in answer to this immediately to Mr. Griffith, Barrister at law, Bristol.

ELEANOR DYOTT.

SAME TO THE SAME.

Clifton, February 13th 1814.

SIR,

I feel that it is too difficult a task for me to enter into the various particulars which combine to make me desire a separation from you; suffice it to say, that our difference of feelings and sentiments, are wholly irreconcileable.

On this alone I can be a competent judge: the interference of others can be of no avail, but what must be done, may be done peaceably and privately. The professional gentleman whom I have consulted, has a large family of his own, and three daughters married, and believe would be more gratified in assisting to unite than

to separate us; if that were now possible, as it is, I believe the most satisfactory method of proceeding on both sides, will be for you to appoint a professional man to settle with him the remaining part of the business.

ELEANOR DYOTT.

Extract of an affidavit filed in the Court of Chancery, by Eleanor Dyott, to recover her pin money, withheld from her.

Eleanor Dyott, complainant, and Edward Harman, (Mrs. Dyott's trustee,) Robert Thompson and William Dyott, defendants.

Eleanor Dyott, wife of William Dyott, one of the above named defendants, the complainant above named, of Bath, in the county of Somerset, maketh oath and saith, that this deponent, and the said William Dyott, intermarried on the 11th day of January, 1806. And this deponent further saith, that, from the time of the said marriage, the conduct of the said William Dyott was so cruel, and his temper so violent, that she was obliged to separate herself and live apart from him: and this deponent further saith, that a correspondence and treaty, or a formal separation, took place between the said William Dyott and this deponent, in and before the month of February last; and that a separation thereafter took place, with and by the consent of the said defendant William Dyott, but no deed of separation was actually

signed, between him and this deponent. And this deponent further saith, that the said William Dyott and this deponent, have never lived together, since the month of May, 1813. Sworn at the Public Office, Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane, this 8th day of December, 1814, before me, W. SMITH.—ELEANOR DYOTT.

Extract of Mr. Robert Thompson's letter to his niece, Mrs. Dyott, on the subject of her husband and her children.

My dear ELEANOR,

Whatever reason you had to complain of their father's conduct, (the said William Dyott) towards you, he is sensible of his past error.

(Signed) ROBERT THOMPSON.

Deponent saith, that on or about the month of March, 1813, whilst residing at Clifton, she employed the said Mr. Griffith, Barrister at Law, to arrange legally between her and the said William Dyott, articles of separation as before stated. Deponent saith, that the said Mr. Griffith had an interview with the said William Dyott at Clifton thereon, in the presence of John Burt, Esq. a friend of the said William Dyott. Deponent further saith, that the result of the interview, between the said William Dyott, Griffith and Burt, was the following paper writing, delivered to deponent by Burt, which de-

ponent concluded, WAS A TOTAL ABANDONMENT of her by the said William Dyott.

Extract, Terms of Separation, March, 5th, 1814.

"I propose that I should return to Lichfield, and take my boys with me, that Mrs. Dyott should continue at Clifton or elsewhere, at her discretion. That at the expiration of six weeks or two months, if Mrs. Dyott is still determined to listen to no terms but those she at present insists on, that then, if Mrs. Dyott perseveres in the resolution of withdrawing herself from her family, I shall take the entire controul and possession of all our children, and she CONSEQUENTLY MUST TAKE WHAT STEPS SHE THINKS PROPER ON SUCH AN OCCASION."

(Signed) WILLIAM DYOTT.

LIEUTENANT GENERAL DYOTT, to MRS. DYOTT.

Lichfield, 16th September, 1814.

The relinquishment of your claim to dower on my estate after my death, will certainly be a material accommodation to me, and I most gladly agree to the terms you mention. Your relinquishment of your claim to dower, will enable me to borrow a sum on mortgage, for the purpose of paying off some of my late brother's bond debts, and will also give me the means of supplying the sum you require: your cloaths, harp, writing desk, &c. shall be forwarded to you without delay. I could *wish you to allow your clock and pictures to remain some*

time longer. I am anxious to save appearances as long as I can, and as I wish to retire to my farm, I hope if they are sent to you, when that takes place, it will put you to no inconvenience. Have you any objection to *Mr. Phillips being employed to prepare the necessary deed?*"

(Signed) WILLIAM DYOTT.

SAME TO THE SAME.

Extract:

Lichfield, 23rd September, 1814.

Your cloaths, harp, writing box, books, &c. have been packed up some time, but the waggons have been full twice, but they are promised to go to-morrow. Florendine packed up your cloaths, under my inspection: I hope they may be all found right; excuse my having given your old red cloak to Peggy, she begging it last winter. I always forgot to mention it. I have just had by this day's post, an application to pay £1,000 on the 18th November, a bond debt of my poor brother's, and where I am to raise the money, I am sure I know not: I am threatened with the law, in case of failure."

(Signed) WILLIAM DYOTT.

Deponent saith, that on the delivery of the said terms of separation by Burt to deponent, the said William Dyott took away all deponent's children, without ever having

visited her during the period of several days; that he was in the house with her at Clifton, aforesaid; Deponent saith, that having been thus ABANDONED by the said William Dyott, and left there at Clifton by him in a strange place, without any relation or friend whatever being with her, neither her sisters, nor her aunt Mrs. Thompson, of Grosvenor Square, remained there to alleviate her sufferings at such a critical period; Deponent saith, that therefore she determined to quit it, and Deponent saith she took a house at Bath, on or about the month of April, 1814, where she RESIDED ENTIRELY SEPARATE, AND APART FROM THE SAID WILLIAM DYOTT; Deponent saith, that during her residence at Bath, she was never *visited* there by the said William Dyott, nor by any of her relations. Deponent saith, that however extraordinary it may appear, it is very true that the said Robert Thompson, her uncle, appeared against her as a witness on the said trial, on the part of Lieutenant-General Dyott, and gave the most contradictory evidence against her.

Deponent saith, that all this time the negociation was going on for the completion of the articles of separation between Deponent and the said William Dyott, by Mr. Griffith.—Deponent saith, that understanding from the letters of the said William Dyott, that it was his wish that the arrangement should be finally drawn up by Mr. Phillips, Conveyancer, and

signed at his house at London; Deponent repaired thither in the month of October, 1814. Deponent saith, that being much indisposed, she was accompanied there by her Physician, which circumstance, however innocent on her part, seemed to have given the said William Dyott, as Deponent verily believes, the occasion he sought to attack the reputation of Deponent, and thereby commence his suit. Deponent saith, that on her arrival at Sloane-street, London, she immediately wrote to the said William Dyott, acquainting him thereof, giving him her address, and informing him that she was then ready to sign the necessary deed or deeds of separation. Deponent saith, that to her great surprise, instead of receiving any answer from the said William Dyott, she was immediately afterwards arrested, and locked up in the rules of the King's Bench, as Deponent verily believes, by the machinations of the said William Dyott.

Deponent saith, that the said William Dyott, accompanied by Robert Thompson, Samuel Thompson and one Brown, with several others, dragged Deponent out of her bed undressed, and with brutal violence conveyed her to the house of the said Brown, where she was confined as a prisoner. Deponent saith, that William Dyott, as Deponent has heard and believes, *gained admission to her, Deponent's residence, by means of police officers, who were armed with a search warrant, which the said William Dyott obtained to search for plate, which he pretended*

had been stolen from him, and in Deponent's possession. Deponent saith, that it was not until after she exhibited articles of the peace against those parties, and caused them to be held to bail, that she obtained her liberty. Deponent also saith, that a *Mrs. Clermont* proved before the House of Lords, as Deponent has heard and believes, *that she gave to General Dyott a box on the ear, turned him out of Deponent's room, and said she would report him to the Duke of York,* in consequence of the cruel treatment of the said William Dyott to Deponent at Downing-street, in the house of the said Mrs. Clermont. Deponent saith, that the said William Dyott having proceeded in his action in the Court of King's Bench, did obtain a verdict and considerable damages against the object of his pursuit; but upon the testimony, as this deponent has heard and believes, of witnesses unworthy of credit, and evidently perjured in Deponent's opinion, from their manifest contradictions, as proved by the notes of Mr. Fraser, the short hand-writer, to which Deponent refers for the truth of her assertions:* Deponent also saith that

* Passing in silent contempt the INFLAMMATORY language of the then Attorney-General, and the MISDIRECTIONS OF THE JUDGE, LORD ELLENBOROUGH, in his summing up to the jury, who appears to have copied word for word the language, DEVOID OF TRUTH, of *Sir William Garrow*. I am prevented, in this place, from motives of delicacy, from saying more than a few words on the evidence of the witnesses examined on the part of General Dyott, and I shall commence with Robert Thompson.

It is necessary to observe here that there were two trials: the first com-

the Judge who tried the cause, (Lord Ellenborough) in his summing upto the Jury, stated that the said defendant had been locked up in the rules of the King's Bench, and

pletely exparté, Lord Ellenborough having refused to give the defendant, in General Dyott's action, time to prepare himself for his defence; and the second, which took place on the 22d day of February, 1815, by order of his Lordship, by which the defendant was enjoined to take short notice of trial.—1st witness, Robert Thompson, sworn at the exparté trial, states "That as far as he *ever saw*, General Dyott and his wife lived *perfectly happy* together, and that *he had opportunities of forming that opinion*—whilst on the trial of the 22d of February *he swears* that in 1813, they lived happy as far as he saw UNTIL THEN, thus contradicting the oath he had previously taken on the exparte trial, "THAT AS FAR AS EVER HE SAW, THEY LIVED PERFECTLY HAPPY TOGETHER."—On his cross-examination he admits that Mrs. Dyott wished to separate herself from her husband, "I warned her of the ill-consequences attending it," said he, in his letter of the 12th April 1814, and adds, "I am afraid it did not produce any effect on her mind."

One may easily judge of the credibility of this witness on reading the extract of his letter transcribed in the affidavit. Further cross-examined, *swears that he had not frequent opportunities of seeing General and Mrs. Dyott after their marriage.*"—Swears that in 1813, he only saw General Dyott three or *four days;* that in January or February in *that year there was some difference that took place between Mrs. Dyott and her husband,*" though on the exparté trial he swears positively that "*for all he ever saw, the parties* (meaning Mrs Dyott and her husband) LIVED PERFECTLY HAPPY TOGETHER, AND THAT HE HAD OPPORTUNITIES OF SEEING THEM TOGETHER, SO AS TO FORM THAT OPINION,"—admits that General Dyott was only a few months acquainted with his wife before marriage—that no property of the General's was settled on Mrs. Dyott—that whatever he had was not much—that he never did see Mrs. Dyott and the General together after the summer of 1813—yet he swears positively that General Dyott visited her in 1814.—Lord Ellenborough alive, no doubt, to these contradictions, asked him when the General visited her?—Thompson replied "I CANNOT SAY WHEN."!

Though he swears positively as above that the General visited her in 1814; yet on further cross-examination he admits never in his sight or presence, after the month of March, 1814; being further interrogated, he swears that he *never saw* them together after *August*, 1813, and states that in that month of August, 1813, he visited her at Clifton, and that he saw the General there at the same time—when afterwards on his cross-examination he swears, *he did not*

that deponent *followed him and lived with him there, and was ready to follow him every where, or words to that effect, observing to the Jury that this, coupled with other*

see them together in August 1813, nor from August 1813 to March 1814, nor after that time at Lichfield ! ! !

The 2d witness called in favour of the General, Mr. Dale, the Aid-de-Camp, nephew of General Dyott, does not appear more fortunate in giving his evidence than the first witness, Mr. Thompson. He is called to prove the *affectionate* conduct of the General, though he did not see the parties together for a year and a half before the trial, and never saw Mrs. Dyott either at Bath or at Bristol in his life, in fact, not since she left Lichfield ; yet on being sworn and asked whether the General left Lichfield to visit her—he replied, " CONSTANTLY."

Mr. Abbot, counsel for General Dyott, who saw no doubt that it was impossible for the Aid-de-Camp to swear that the General visited her at Clifton who never was there himself, observed, " that is whenever he had opportunities of doing so—" CERTAINLY ! !" replied the Aid-de-Camp. Questioned by Lord Ellenborough, " Every thing whether absent or present denoted *attachment to his wife?* MOST CERTAINLY, my Lord, replied Dale.—On his cross-examination, by Mr. Scarlett, he swears *positively* that he *saw* the General and his wife together in March or April 1814, though above he has sworn that he did not see her since she left Lichfield, and went to Bath or Bristol, (in fact she went to Clifton) and that was in the year 1813. Again, on being further interrogated, he swears that it was in 1813 "CERTAINLY," the last time he saw Mrs. Dyott, admits he never did go with the General to see her at Clifton or Bristol, whilst above he swears positively that the General visited her there " CONSTANTLY ! !"—Question by Mr. Scarlett—" Did you ever accompany him to these places?" Answer, " No, I never did !"—Mr. Scarlett—" Where he went to, you don't know ?" " *Yes, I do,*" replied the Aid-de-Camp, " for *I had letters from him from Clifton first, and then Bath and Bristol.*"

Now the Aid-de-Camp is flatly contradicted by the General himself, who swears in his affidavit, to hold defendant to bail, that he never visited his wife at Bath. The following answers to the interrogatories of Mr. Scarlett, shew the *evasions* and *contradictions* of this *witness*, so as to prove him *unworthy* of all *credit*—question, " When was the last date of any letter, with the Bristol post-mark upon it ?" Answer, " General Dyott was removed from the Staff in June, 1813." Question, " Is that the period you received letters with the Bristol post-mark upon them ?" " I had

things which, Deponent saith, is equally false, left no doubt on his mind of the criminality of the parties, when the truth is, that it was Deponent that was arrested and in the rules of the King's Bench as before stated, and not the said defendant; and that he only resided in the same house as her physician, she being then in a very dangerous state of health.

Deponent further saith, that the said William Dyott shortly afterwards on this verdict, so obtained as aforesaid, commenced a suit against her in Doctor's Commons,

letters afterwards, but not on military duty, private letters!" Question. "What was the latest date of any of them?"—Answer. "I CANNOT SAY POSITIVELY!" Question. "Did you receive any after the month of March, 1814?" "I CANNOT POSITIVELY SAY!!!" Question. "Do you remember when the General brought the children from Clifton to Lichfield?" Answer. "I CANNOT POSITIVELY SAY!!!"

The third witness is a Mrs. Dyott, sister-in-law to the General. The whole amount of her evidence on oath, goes to say that she had no doubt that the General CONSTANTLY visited his wife at Clifton, though she never saw her there—on her cross-examination she admits, however, that she had never laid eyes upon her since she left Lichfield in 1813!!!

Helen Dale, wife of the Aid-de-Camp, General Dyott's nephew, examined. Swears that Mrs. Dyott was *not of a disposition to please any body.* —Cross-examined by Mr. Topping. "Do you mean to say that she was as kind to the General as he to her?' Answer. "*No, I never said that, nor do I mean to say it.*"

Col. Desbrow, the fifth witness, sworn and examined by the Attorney-General. He had the pleasure of seeing Mrs. Dyott at Lichfield ONE DAY *three* or *four years ago*, when he was in Staffordshire, coming from the Races—in his own words "I was *domesticated* there for one night only, and I had been several hours in her company."

Whatever the conduct of my female relations might have been towards me, the General did not, however, find it expedient to call them, as counsel would have had the opportunity on cross-examination of getting at the truth; one will see the weakness of his cause by calling the last

for the sole purpose, as she verily believes, of stripping her finally of the entire of her property, even her pin-money, as before stated. Deponent saith, she has heard and believes that many of the witnesses who attended and gave evidence on behalf of the said William Dyott, in the said suit were suborned.——Deponent saith, that having been thus unjustly persecuted by the said William Dyott for the reasons before mentioned, she was under the necessity of employing professional men to defend her.——Deponent saith, that for this purpose

witness, who evidently could not know any thing at all about our manner of living.—

Florendine, servant to General Dyott, the sixth witness examined on oath. "The last time she saw the General at Clifton, was when he came there to take the children away from their mother in March 1814,"—*admits that the General remained in the same house with her mistress five days, but did not see her—remains still with the General*—States positively that the *defendant* in General Dyott's action, never visited Mrs. Dyott at Clifton.

The seventh witness, Robert Beale the footman, swears that he was hired at Bath to Mrs. Dyott, in the month of August 1814, and did not see the *defendant*, in the General's action, until three or four days after he went to live there, and that he was received in the drawing-room in his professional capacity; that Mrs. Dyott, when in London, was carried away by several men to Major Browne's, at Westminster.

To conclude this note, already too long, and much longer than I had first intended it should have been—the flippant perjury of the witnesses, especially a woman named Briggs, a lodging-house keeper, of Sloane-Street, and Ann Wells, servant to Anne Mays, lodging-house-keeper, in the same street, who also figured in this attack upon my character, together with a chairwoman named Sarah Howard, the wife of a carpenter residing at Newington—is more than self-evident, and really too contemptible and ridiculous for me to descant upon, and as I have before observed in another part of this work, impartial justice would have seen that many of these witnesses were suborned.

she employed Thomas M'Kiernan, agent or partner in the house of Messrs. Slade, Bedford and Slade, of Bennet's Hill, Proctors. Deponent saith, that while the suit was pending, she had occasion to go to France, for the benefit of her health, leaving an authority with the said Thomas M'Kiernan to defend her. Deponent saith, that she received the following letters from the said Thomas M'Kiernan in the year 1816, on the subject of her affairs.

MR. MC. KIERNAN TO MRS. DYOTT.

Doctor's Commons, 29th March, 1816.

MADAM,

A copy of the Divorce Bill brought into the House of Lords, on the part of General Dyott, has been this afternoon served on Mr. Felix Slade, as your proctor, in consequence of your absence, by which it appears that the General wishes to deprive you of every means of support out of your fortune, and to aggrandize himself with the whole of your property. Here under you have a copy of one of the clauses as a specimen. 'And be it further enacted, that the said annuity or yearly sum of £800, by the said hereinbefore in part recited Indenture of release and settlement of the 11th day of January 1806, provided or settled for the sole and separate use of the said Elinor otherwise Eleanor Dyott, during the term of her natural life, and also the estate and interest thereby

limited to her for her life, in remainder expectant on the decease of the said William Dyott, of and in all the trust property and all other provisions by the same Indenture, and the said indenture of the 30th day of January, 1806, respectively made for her, the said Elinor, otherwise Eleanor Dyott, and all terms of years remainder and powers by the said settlement respectively created or given, or therein contained, for securing, recovering, or enforcing the payment of the said annuity, or such other provisions for her, the said Elinor, otherwise Eleanor Dyott as aforesaid, shall from and after the passing of this act, cease, determine, and be utterly void and of no effect, AND SHALL BE TAKEN AND CONSTRUED TO BE AS IF THE SAID ELINOR, OTHERWISE ELEANOR, WERE ACTUALLY DEAD.' By the above clause, you will perceive how the General wishes to serve you in case their Lordships' attend to the prayer in his Bill, the second reading of which is expected to be postponed, from the second of April, till after the Easter recess.

(Signed) THOMAS M'KIERNAN.

SAME TO THE SAME.

Doctors' Commons, 12th April, 1816.

MADAM,

I wrote to you on Friday last, upon a copy of the Bill brought into Parliament by General Dyott being served upon Mr. Felix Slade, as your proctor, in which

letter, to which I beg leave to refer you. I sent a copy of the clause in the Bill, by which the General wishes to deprive you of the whole of your £800, per annum, pin money, and to aggrandize himself with your property. (Signed) THOMAS M'KIERNAN.

SAME TO THE SAME.

Doctors' Commons, 2nd April, 1816.

MADAM,

Your respective favours of the 1st and 3rd inst. were duly received by me, under the authority of which Mr. Felix Slade and myself waited upon the ABLEST PLEADER,* at the bar of the House of Lords, with whom we consulted upon the best mode to be adopted for your interest; and he has undertaken your defence, and to *oppose* the Bill in *all its stages*. And as you have *placed implicit confidence in me* upon this occasion, that there shall be no ABUSE OF SUCH CONFIDENCE ON MY PART, and that in every step taken the utmost ECONOMY shall be observed, and with a view to this object, and of *preventing heavy and enormous bills being made out against you, I must request that you will please refer your Solicitor to me*, for *all ne-*

* Randle Jackson, Esq. This gentleman received twenty guineas as a retaining fee, charged in Slade and Cos. bill, to Mrs. Dyott, no doubt for the extraordinary abilities of this *Celebrated Barrister*. P. S. His clerk received *only a one pound note!!* This is the economy no doubt, of which Mr. M'Kiernan so *kindly* speaks.

cessary instructions; and I will take care that no step shall be taken, but by the advice of your Counsel, who is a MAN OF THE GREATEST EXPERIENCE, AND OF THE HIGHEST CHARACTER, HONOR AND INTEGRITY, AND ONE UPON WHOM I CAN DEPEND.* As it is thought advisable to proceed in the appeal from Sir William Scott's sentence, I have enclosed a proxy for that purpose, which you will be good enough to execute in the presence of two subscribing witnesses, and then return the same as soon as possible. I should recommend the witnesses to be your bankers, as their hand writing can be easily proved here, if occasion should require it. I shall immediately send a copy of the bill to Mr. Harman, and request him to communicate its contents to your other trustees without loss of time, that they may all have a perfect knowledge of what *General Dyott is about to do with respect to you and your property.* I wish to know, if Mr. Hartley has acknowledged to you, the receipt of £100 from me on your account, and I beg leave to remain

(Signed) THOMAS M'KIERNAN.

Deponent further saith, that a few months after her arrival at Paris, she received the letter from the said Thomas M'Kiernan, who observes, that some law process had been served upon Mr. Felix Slade, her proctor, and at the same time she received another letter from

* Encore Mr. Jackson.

one James Hartley, an attorney, a friend, as deponent verily believes, of the said Thomas M'Kiernan, who strenuously advised this Deponent to give her power of attorney to the said Thomas M'Kiernan, for the purpose of receiving this deponent's eight hundred pounds a year from the hands of Edward Harman, of Adams Court, Esquire, her trustee, who has done every thing he possibly could to *irritate* and *vex* her; Deponent saith, that believing the said James Hartley and Thomas M'Kiernan to be honest men, and upon the *representation* and *advice* of the said James Hartley, she did forthwith sign the power of attorney sent to her by the said James Hartley, and returned it by post to London. Deponent saith, that in two or three months afterwards, when she found herself enabled to undertake the journey, she proceeded to and arrived in London, in April, 1816. Deponent saith, that by this time, the said James Hartley had received one hundred pounds by virtue of the said power of attorney from the said Thomas M'Kiernan, for business done or pretended to be done by the said James Hartley, in the Court of Chancery. Deponent saith, that the said Thomas M'Kiernan, Slade and Co. have received £1842 4*s*. 4*d* of and on her account; £1300 of which, by virtue of the said power of attorney, and £350 by the note of hand of the said William Dyott, and £191 15*s*. 4*d*. of Deponent; and Deponent saith, that she has received from time to time various scraps of accounts

from the said Thomas M'Kiernan amounting to a considerable sum of money, which Deponent, verily believes is neither just nor reasonable, in as much as one item in one of the bills of the said Messrs Slade and Co., charges Deponent with the sum of *twenty guineas*, as a retaining fee for Randle Jackson, Esq. Barrister at Law, *and one guinea* for his *clerk;* Deponent saith, that being informed, that many of the charges contained in these bills of the house of Slade and Co. are erroneous and unjust—she addressed to them the following letter.

TO MESSRS. SLADE AND CO.

" Blackheath, January, 13th, 1821.

GENTLEMEN,

" I have frequently addressed myself to Mr. M'Kiernan your agent, or partner, respecting my accounts with your house to no effect, I am therefore induced to apply immediately to you on the same subject.—I have repeatedly demanded a general bill of receipts, disbursements, and for business done, and I have received nothing from Mr. M'Kiernan, but scraps of bills, and I may say with truth that they are unintelligible; for example, the last five bills he has sent me just received, now before me in the Consistory Court, Doctors' Commons, and Arches Court, amounting to the sum of £206 17*s.* 10*d.* are furnished without saying to whom I am

debtor, nor are the said bills signed by any person whatever. To be plain with you, Gentlemen, it is my intention to tax your bills of costs for the business done on my account. I have therefore to request that you will have the goodness to furnish me forthwith, with a general bill, for that purpose. You cannot possibly have any objection to comply with my request, and surely you ought not to have permitted your clerk, agent or partner, to have so long trifled with one of your clients, who has been so extremely ill-treated from the first moment of her having employed the same Mr. M'Kiernan. *I could have scarcely believed to have found in the house of Messrs. Slade and Co. a man capable of denying my having returned to him a bill of costs, and even of having seen it when lately he admitted the fact:* in truth I put into his hands a bill of £1269 8*s.* 2*d.*, one entire bill delivered by Mr. Hartley, and which I intended to have taxed, having afterwards demanded Mr. M'Kiernan to re-deliver it for that purpose; instead of doing so, he makes it into three divisions, which would seem as if he wished to throw some difficulties in my way for taxing the whole. You will perceive by the following passage of his letter of this date, the absolute necessity of my addressing your house directly to have an *eclaircissement* on the subject, as I am sure you will admit that the following passage in his letter is totally unintelligible. "The bill (said he,) Mr. Mount called upon me with, according to the best of

my recollection, was Mr. Hartley's bill for proceeding in the House of Lords, to amend the act obtained by General Dyott, in 1816." This upon more mature reflection, must have been the bill Mr. Mount called upon me with, or about, but he refused to let me have it to inspect when he called upon me the first time, and when he called upon me a second time to proceed upon the inspection of it, your most extraordinary letter of the 9th of January, 1819, just then received, prevented any *single thing* further being done by me in the business:" requesting your answer without delay,

I am, Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
ELEANOR DYOTT.

Deponent saith, that neither Thomas M'Kiernan, nor Messrs. Slade and Co. have delivered to her the general bill according to her demand in the above recited letter, and the bills that were delivered never having been taxed, she is therefore unable to say the real sum due to the House of the said Messrs. Slade and Co.; and the more so when deponent observes, that in one of the said bills, the said Thomas M'Kiernan charges her five pounds commission for £100 that she gave him with her own hand to keep for her. Deponent saith, that she is in possession of vouchers for the sum of £1842 4*s*. 4*d*. received by the said Thomas M'Kiernan, and Messrs. Slade and Co. Deponent also saith, that the said

William Dyott, as this Deponent has heard and believes, had by the most infamous means, succeeded in his suit in Doctors' Commons, and afterwards presented a bill in Parliament. And Deponent saith, that the said James Hartley, who had been hitherto concerned for Deponent in other affairs and businesses, continued to be her attorney and defended the said bill in Parliament; Deponent saith that she verily believes she failed in the said bill owing to the negligence, ignorance, or interested motives of the said James Hartley, and the said Thomas M'Kiernan, for Deponent saith, that that bill had confirmed that part of her marriage settlement, which gave to Deponent her pin-money of eight hundred pounds a year, and her interest in the trust estate, of more than two thousand pounds a year, including her pin money, after the death of the said William Dyott.

Deponent saith that the said James Hartley and Thomas M'Kiernan, pretending to have discovered an error in the said bill, the said James Hartley wrote to the Lord Chancellor, as Deponent heard and believes, pointing out this pretended error, and though his Lordship, by his letter to the said James Hartley, stated, *that he thought a decision against Mrs. Dyott would not be a sound decision*, yet the said Thomas M'Kiernan told her that if she did not bring in a bill in parliament immediately, *she would be totally ruined.* Deponent saith, that being alarmed at this intelligence, and influenced by

the representations of the said Thomas M'Kiernan, and fearing the loss of the whole of her property, she was induced to give her authority, at the special instance and request of the said Thomas M'Kiernan, to the bringing in of the said bill, by the said James Hartley. Deponent saith, that by these means, the said James Hartley was enabled to make out an enormous bill of costs against her, for prosecuting the said bill, and the said Thomas M'Kiernan, under pretence of being liable to pay the bills of the said James Hartley, retained her power of attorney, and received her £800 a year from her trustee, the said Edward Harman, though she was present in London herself; and Deponent further saith, that the said Thomas M'Kiernan, after having himself, Slade and Co., received of, and for the use of Deponent, £1842 4s. 4d. refused to deliver up to Deponent her power of attorney, she was therefore obliged to revoke it at a considerable expense. And Deponent saith, that the said Thomas M'Kiernan had actually charged her at the rate of £5 per cent. for receiving her £800. a year.

Deponent saith, that after the enormous expenditure of money, or pretended expenditure by the said James Hartley and Thomas M'Kiernan, she has had the misfortune to have lost the chief interest in the trust estate, after the death of the said William Dyott. Deponent having now by the bill presented by the said James Hartley, only one-fourth of the above mentioned interest,

for which he the said James Hartley makes a bill of costs, amounting to no less a sum than £950.

Deponent saith, that the said James Hartley has made out bills against her, to the *enormous* sum of £2219 8s. 2d. besides interest on promissory notes, and money she paid *for stamps, together with* £10. *charged by the said James Hartley for having arrested Deponent at his own suit, which latter sum Deponent paid for the use of the said James Hartley to Mr. Hudson, over and above the said sum of* £2219 8s. 2d., *and for which she has never received any account whatever.* Deponent further saith, that the first bill of £1269 8s. 2d. was delivered by the said James Hartley to the said Thomas M'Kiernan, as Deponent verily believes, which included the *business done by the said James Hartley, for Deponent in the court of Chancery;* and Deponent saith, that in her opinion, the second account of £950, delivered by the said James Hartley to deponent, is only a continuation of the former bill of costs of £1269 8s. 2d. making together the said sum of £2219 8s. 2d.; and Deponent saith, that she verily believes *that the bill she brought into parliament was the effect of a particular understanding between the said James Hartley, and the said Thomas M'Kiernan, though Deponent positively saith, that the said Thomas M'Kiernan told her, that the said James Hartley had agreed and promised the said Thomas M'Kiernan, as agent for Deponent, that the said James Hartley would*

not make any professional charges whatever for the same, owing to the error left by them, the said James Hartley and Thomas M'Kiernan, in the former bill in parliament.

Deponent saith, that in a conversation she had with the said Thomas M'Kiernan on the subject of the said bill of £1269 8s. 2d. of the said James Hartley, he told her not to be at all uneasy about it, pretending to her that it would be curtailed. Deponent saith, that finding the said Thomas M'Kiernan only trifled with her respecting the account of £1269 8s. 2d. of the said James Hartley, she determined to put the said bill into the hands of an attorney, for the purpose of having it legally examined.

Deponent saith, that she intimated the same to the said Thomas M'Kiernan, and in a few days afterwards, to her great astonishment, she discovered that the said bill of £1269 8s. 2d. had *disappeared.* Deponent saith, that from that hour to this, she never has been able to get sight of the said bill, though she has frequently demanded it, but that the said Thomas M'Kiernan afterwards sent her the amount of the said bill, divided into three parts, amounting to the sum of £1085 3s. 5d., which with another bill of the said James Hartley, previously delivered to Deponent by the said Thomas M'Kiernan, *for business done in Chancery* by the said James Hartley, amounting to the sum of £184 4s. 9d. or thereabouts,

making in the whole the said £1269 8s. 2d. to the best of this Deponent's recollection and belief. Deponent saith, that learning from various persons of the law, that those bills of the said James Hartley were excessive, and out of all proportion, together with his said bill of £950, she had resolved to tax them. Deponent saith, that for this purpose she had employed several attornies at a considerable expense, but the want of the original bill of £1269 8s. 2d. appeared to be a complete bar against Deponent's obtaining justice. Deponent saith, that being thus embarrassed, she took the opinion of Mr. Brougham upon the subject of taxing these bills, which is as follows, and for which she gave five guineas to Mr. Charsley, to be paid to that Barrister.

MR. BROUGHAM'S OPINION.

"There is no manner of taxing parliamentary bills of costs, but if such charges are mixed in a Solicitor's bill with charges for business in courts, the whole is liable to taxation. If part of a bill is for taxable charges, part not, the whole must be delivered a month before action brought. (*Winter* 6. *Payne* 6. T. R. 645. Hill v.)

"But when the whole is for parliamentary business, the existence of a separate bill for taxable charges does not effect it."

"H. B. Temple, June 5th 1818."

Deponent saith, that shortly after she had directed Mr. Charsley, attorney, to take Mr. Brougham's said opinion, she was arrested at the suit of the said James Hartley, for the sum of £1000, and upwards, though Deponent verily believes that not one of the bills of the said James Hartley were signed by him previously to her being so arrested; Deponent further saith that she verily believes that the reason of the original bill of £1269 8s. 2d. so mysteriously disappearing, was, that the said James Hartley and Thomas M'Kiernan had discovered, after its delivery, that such was the law as stated in the opinion of Mr. Brougham; and that by the want of the original bill, Deponent would thereby be prevented from taxing the whole amount of the said James Hartley's costs; Deponent also saith, that in consequence of her being so arrested, as aforesaid, she was locked up at the house of Stephen Copland, at Blackheath, in the County of Kent, although a few days previously, the said James Hartley received from the hands of Deponent £200 in bank notes, as appears by his receipt in Deponent's possession, and although the said James Hartley had received (before the period of Deponent's being so arrested as aforesaid), of, and on account of Deponent, the sum of £900.

Deponent saith, that being so arrested, and locked up by her own attorney, without his bills being taxed, for the enormous sum of £1000, she found it impossible to procure bail, and the more so as the said Thomas

M'Kiernan refused to deliver to Deponent her power of attorney; Deponent saith, that being thus illegally, as she has heard, and believes, deprived of her liberty, she had no other resource than to remain in the lock-up house, where she continued for the space of four months, and afterwards was obligedto surrender herself to the custody of the warden of the Fleet prison, where Deponent remained about four months longer;* Deponent saith, that being determined to defend the said action, of the said James Hartley, and to expose his arbitrary and cruel treatment of this Deponent, and above all to resist his gross impositions, she employed several attornies for that purpose, amongst others, Messrs. Charsley, Hamilton, Mount, and Hudson, whom obtained of Deponent considerable sums of money, which they had charged as costs, though neither the one nor the other did defend the action of the said James Hartley, as this Deponent verily believes.

Deponent saith, that being thus imprisoned and harrassed by several lawyers, and deprived of considerable sums of money, amounting in the whole to the sum of about £100, she was under the necessity of coming into the terms dictated to her by the said James Hartley; and, therefore, at the recommendation of the said Mr. Hudson, and to recover her liberty, she signed promis-

* Mrs. Dyott during the eight months imprisonment, was never visited by one of her family; nor did she ever hear that they enquired whether she was living or dead.

sory notes, at various dates, amounting to the sum of £702 16*s*. 5*d*., making, together with the monies he had already received, the sum of £1802 16*s*. 5*d*. Deponent saith, that the whole of those notes, with interest thereon, have been paid, excepting two, bearing date the 20th January, 1819, the one drawn at thirty months after date, bearing interest, for the sum of £125, and the other, at three years after date, for the sum of £77 16*s*. 5*d*., also bearing interest. Deponent saith, that when she gave those notes to the said James Hartley, it was at a time when she was locked up in the Fleet Prison, as before stated, and despaired, for the reasons before mentioned, of ever being enabled to defend the said action, for the reasons aforesaid; or to have his bills of costs taxed for the same reasons.

Deponent saith, that at a *moment* when she was tormented and irritated by the conduct of the said Thomas M'Kiernan, and when she was made to believe, which she has since found to be a *false* statement of facts, that it was to the exertions of the said James Hartley that she owed every thing, that she did write to the said Thomas M'Kiernan that she was not inclined to dispute the accounts of the said James Hartley, or words to that effect, because the impression on her mind at the time, was, that he had rendered her service, not thinking that he was, as Deponent has since heard and believes, the principal cause of her misfortune, respecting her bill in parliament,

or that he brought in the said bill in parliament conjointly with the said Thomas M'Kiernan, for the express purpose, as Deponent now verily believes he did, to put money into his own pocket, and by which shameful proceedings, Deponent has lost the greater part of her interest in the trust estate as aforesaid.

Deponent saith, that she transcribes herein, a letter of the said James Hartley to Thomas M'Kiernan without any further comment, than to observe that that letter had been written to the said M'Kiernan a very short time before deponent was arrested.

March 6th, 1818.

"DEAR SIR,

Mrs. Dyott begs me to ask you for the receipts, I gave you for monies received by me of you: I called in the Commons on you, but you were ill with the gout, from which I trust you have recovered.

I am, &c.

(Signed,) JAMES HARTLEY."

Deponent saith, that she has been advised to resist the payment of the two last mentioned promissory notes of £125, and £77 16s. 5d. until the bills of costs of the said James Hartley be taxed; and Deponent also saith, that she has been advised to apply to this honourable

court, and to demand justice in the premises, and to pray that the said James Hartley be ordered to furnish to the deponent a copy of his original bill of £1269 8s. 2d. and that the same be referred to the master to be taxed, together with his succeeding bill of £950. And that the said James Hartley be ordered to give credit to this Deponent for all sums of money received by him of and on account of Deponent, and to refund and pay over to Deponent or to her attorney whatever sum or sums of money that may be found due and owing to her; and that the said James Hartley, or any other person on his behalf, be restrained from suing her for the said two promissory notes before mentioned yet unpaid, until the bills of costs of the said James Hartley be taxed. And also, that the said Thomas Kiernan, on the part of the said Messrs. Slade and Co., be ordered to furnish Deponent with a general account of all business done by him and them, and to give an account of all disbursements and expenditures of whatever nature soever made by himself or the said Messrs. Slade and Co.; and to give credit to Deponent for all monies received of her, and on her account, from the commencement of the first transactions between them, for the purpose of being taxed by the proper officer. And that the said Thomas M'Kiernan and the said Messrs. Slade and Co. be ordered to refund whatever balance they may have in their hands belonging to this deponent; and that all of them, together with the said James Hartley, may deliver up all

documents and paper writings whatever belonging to Deponent in their custody and power, and answer the matter of this affidavit on oath.

ELEANOR DYOTT.

Sworn at Guildhall, London, the 17th day of January, 1821,
Before me,
C. ABBOTT.

In giving *le dernier coup de pinceau* to this disgusting picture, I cannot omit the insertion of Mr. Jackson's note, the "*ablest pleader at the bar of the House of Lords*," (according to Mr. M'Kiernan,) to whom I paid, with my own hand, £75 for this fatal bill brought by me into Parliament, and who received of me, for his services, in defending the former bill of General Dyott about £150.

I am inspired by no other motives whatever, but those of *admiration* for the extraordinary talents of this eminent Barrister, in giving to the world our *petite* correspondence, as follows.

Extract of a Letter from MRS. DYOTT *to* MR. JACKSON.

Blackheath, January 12th, 1821.

SIR,

As I am upon this subject, I beg to observe to you, that, in transmitting to Mr. M'Kiernan nine shillings, you forgot to accompany it with ten guineas which

you had received of Mr. Hartley, and which no doubt, had escaped your memory; for you must recollect, that in the payment of £75 which I made to you, this ten guineas was again paid to you. The impositions to that have been practised upon me, and the effects of the unfortunate ill-advised bill, which I brought into Parliament, require every exertion of mine at this moment to recover back at least a part of the monies that have been so much over-charged.

May I, Sir, ask you if you really have received twenty guineas as a retaining fee on my account, charged in the bill of Messrs. Slade and Co., if so, I am sure, that you will see the propriety of returning at least, fifteen of it with the ten guineas already mentioned, and for the reasons already expressed; for I perceive by the list of your charges now before me, you never require more than five guineas for a retaining fee.

ELEANOR DYOTT.

MR. JACKSON TO MRS. DYOTT.

" Mr. Jackson's compliments—waits on Mrs. Dyott; with regard to his fees, he begs leave to refer her to her Solicitor, who, undoubtedly has, as is usual, Mr. J.'s signature for such as he may have received, and who is the proper person to adjust errors in the account, if any have taken place; though, according to Mr. J's recollection, there were several attendances and consultations for

which, under the circumstances of her then situation, he declined taking fees."

"Temple, January 15th, 1821."

MRS. DYOTT'S *answer to the preceding note of* RANDLE JACKSON, Esq.

Blackheath, January 18th 1821.

SIR,

A person entirely ignorant of the contents of your letter of the 19th August, 1817, wherein you acknowledge the receipt of £75 paid to you by my own hands, for what you call your Parliamentary fees, would suppose, on perusing your note of the 15th instant, that your *benevolent spirit* had been put considerably in action in my affairs, and that your *numerous* consultations had been administered *gratis*, and your powerful *eloquence* at the House of Lords bestowed on some unhappy person, whose circumstances and means demanded your *commisseration*. But, in spite of all this generosity and the numerous consultations, and, even the "mass of conversation" of which Mr. Jackson "takes no notice" and, even the "*special* consultations of great length," she lost her bill in Parliament. She with great diffidence, begs to ask Counsellor Jackson by what rule in logic, she can apply to her solicitor, respecting the payment of £75, which she had the misfortune to pay herself, to Mr. Jackson, she confesses prematurely. She begs leave to differ with Mr. Jackson, with respect to the adjustment of errors, for she considers herself equally capable with her solicitor in this respect, and, if Mr. Jack-

son will be so obliging as to furnish his bill, which she has never yet seen, she will convince him of the fact: the truth is, she paid Mr. Jackson £75 in bank notes, as acknowledged by his letter of the 19th of August, 1817, certainly without mature consideration; she should, however, suppose this could be no objection to Mr. Jackson giving her the satisfaction to know, that she has only done right.* She again invites Mr. Jackson to be explicit with respect to the retaining fee of 20 guineas, and one *guinea* for his clerk; and if he has actually received it, he cannot, as *a man of honour*, do otherwise than return at least 15 guineas of it, together with the ten guineas he received of Mr. Hartley; of this latter sum, there can be no question, as Mrs. D. is in possession of his receipt for it. I cannot suppose, indeed I *will not*, that Mr. Jackson is *capable* of any sort of *evasion*, he must well know, however, that a solicitor can have nothing to do with the sum she has paid herself, as she has before observed, of course he can have nothing to do with the errors in the account. I should be sorry to be obliged to resort to any public means for the recovery of those sums, which are so justly my due. I have no doubt on reflection, you will comply with the request of

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

ELEANOR DYOTT.

* Mr. M'Kiernan has always concealed Mr. Jackson's *original* bill.

Mr. Jackson to Mrs. Dyott.

(Extract.) August 19th, 1817.

Madam,

I have your favour of the 18th August, enclosing in bank notes £75, being the amount of my parliamentary fees, for your bill of last sessions. I presume you have taken the amount from a paper delivered to Mr. M'Keirnan, which contains also some remarks on the items.

(Signed) Randle Jackson.

Mr. Jackson's Bill, the paper alluded to by him in his letter, delivered to Mr M'Kiernan.

DYOTT'S AMENDED BILL.

Lords.

1817.		£.	s.
Feb.	27 Con. as to general proceedings, and drawing petition	5	10
	Drawing Bill - - -	10	10
May	22 Con. - - - -	5	5
	29 Con. going through clauses of altered bill	5	5
	30 Ditto and drawing others - -	5	5
June	19 Con. and special petition - -	5	5

Commons.

	24 Con. and special petition - -	5	5
July	1 Attendance - - -	10	10
	2 Con. and petition. 3d reading -	5	5
	8 Con. and further petition - -	5	5
	7 Attendance - - -	10	10
	Con. with the other side (who finally agreed to our causes)	5	5

Received 10 Guineas.

POST SCRIPTUM.

In taking leave of Mr. Jackson, I have only one observation to make before closing this work, on his colleague Mr. Hartley, of whom I have already said so much.

This Attorney dared in his letter to me of the 15th January, 1818, *accuse* the Lord Chancellor of an "OVERSIGHT" in my case, and boasted that it was entirely OWING to his "*prompt and laborious measures*" that the remnant of my fortune was saved—but this is not all. —In speaking of his preposterous bill of costs, he endeavoured to persuade me that "half the members of the House of Commons would prove the *justice* of his demand." The indignation, however, of Mr. Lockhart is well verified in the following passage of his letter.

MR. LOCKHART, M.P. TO MRS. DYOTT.

(Extract.)

13th April, 1818.

MADAM,

I must beg leave to assure you that I never said to Mr. Hartley that I would come forward to justify his charges, or any words to that effect. I never saw them or heard of them, nor had I ever the least intercourse with him on the subject, or knowledge of it, and I shall certainly request to learn of him why he has taken such a liberty with my name.

(Signed) J. LOCKHART.

THE END.

LONDON:
SHACKELL AND ARROWSMITH, JOHNSON'S-COURT, FLEET-STREET.